

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment, filed on 1/20/06, is acknowledged.
2. Claims 31-58 are pending and being acted upon presently

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

4. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 31-52, drawn to a recombinant protein comprising a fragment of an alpha-integrin for producing at least one recombinant protein of interest in a cell, with the exception of a mammalian cell.
- II. Claims 53-55, drawn to a nucleic acid sequence coding for at least one recombinant protein of interest comprising a fragment of an alpha-integrin for producing at least one recombinant protein of interest in a cell, with the exception of a mammalian cell, vector and a host cell.
- III. Claims 56-58, drawn to a method for producing at least one protein of interest.

5. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The invention of Group I was found to have no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art of McKay *et al* (JBC, 271:30544-30547, 1996) OR Krukonis *et al* (JBC, 273*27):31837-31843, 1998) (see entire documents).

McKay *et al* teaches extracellular domain of human α IIb and β 3 were expressed by co-infection of *Trichoplusia ni* (High Five) insect cells (non-mammalian cell) with recombinant baculoviruses. Soluble human α IIb (residues 1-964) was produced (a recombinant protein comprising a fragment of an alpha-integrin) from a 3-kilobase cDNA fragment encoding the extracellular domains (see page 30544, under *Synthesis of interspecies β 3 subunit chimeras* in particular). (The term protein of interest can read on α IIb, β 3 or the chimeras).

Art Unit: 1644

Krukonis et al teach 20 proteins comprising a fragment of an alpha integrin (see Fig. 1B in particular). It is noted the claim is constructed as product by process. However, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985), MPEP 2113. It is Applicant's burden to show that the manufacturing process steps would be expected to impart distinctive structural characteristics to the final product.

Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

Species Election

6. Irrespective of whichever group applicant may elect, applicant is further required under 35 US 121 (1) to elect a single disclosed species to which claims would be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable and (2) to list all claims readable thereon including those subsequently added.

- A. If Group I or II is elected, applicant is required to elect a single specific alpha-integrin subunit such as the one recited in claims 37-43 and a single specific protein of interest such as the one recited in claim 50. These are distinct species because their structures and modes of action are different which, in turn, address different therapeutic endpoints.

7. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered

Art Unit: 1644

timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

8. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1644

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maher Haddad whose telephone number is (571) 272-0845. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen B. O'Hara can be reached on (571) 272-0878. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 11, 2008

/Maher M. Haddad/
Primary Examiner,
Art Unit 1644